



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0375OR-1 for Salem-Keizer School District 24J

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has presented a reform vision for the Salem-Keizer School District (SKSD) and has been working towards schoolwide reform in all district schools for the past five years, including strategies such as a K-12 literacy model implemented in all schools and across all subject areas, PLCs with structures and protocols that support the move to data-intense review leading to changes in instruction and standards-based evaluation systems to support a more qualified professional and staff workforce in schools and at the district level.</p> <p>The applicant has responded to the four core educational assurance areas as set forth in the notice. Overall, the applicant states that each of the four core educational assurance areas correlates to sections of the district's strategic plan for this year. However, the evidence offered as the strategic plan appears to be an overview sheet to the strategic plan.</p> <p>That said, with regard to Core Educational Assurance Area 1, <i>'Adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy'</i>: district staff has been trained in and has begun use of a college and career readiness (CCR) tool called CampusReady, that builds a dataset which recognizes the degrees of CCR at each school. This is a three-year project which, when fully implemented, will lead to development of instructional and social supports to the students whose differentiated needs have been identified through the four domains of the CCR tool. (Strategic Plan 2)</p> <p>Corresponding to Core Educational Assurance Area 2, <i>'Building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals with data about how they can improve instruction'</i>: the district has developed a data warehouse that is <u>updated daily</u> and is populated with various data (e.g. demographic, discipline, attendance data and state and local assessment data). Staff is able to access and use this data to identify students in need of targeted interventions during the day, such as 7th Period Mandatory Homework Help, Homework Lunch and Teacher Change, where a student who requires a fresh start or a different instructional style, is transferred to the same course with a different teacher. (Strategic Plan 1)</p> <p>The SKSD has been working with the professional education organizations representing teachers, principals and support staff to develop new evaluation frameworks that directly respond to Core Educational Assurance Area 3, <i>'Recruiting, developing, rewarding and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most'</i>. These revised evaluation frameworks align with the national Interstate Educator and Assessment Consortium (InTASC) and Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards. While the Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) Grant and research project supports research that relates teacher performance and assessment to student growth and outcomes in 10 SKSD schools, there is no discussion regarding placement of teachers or principals "where they are needed most" as stated in this Core Educational Assurance Area. (Strategic Plans 5 and 4)</p> <p>With respect to Core Educational Assurance Area 4, <i>'Turning around lowest-achieving schools'</i>: the applicant states, "SKSD has a track record of success in turning around low performing schools" and cites gains in student achievement in four School Improvement Grant (SIG) schools; three high schools and one elementary school. However, these schools are not named, and thus the reviewer does not know if these three high schools are participants in this proposal. Additionally, the student achievement gains referred to are not listed in this section of the proposal. (Strategic Plans 3 and 6)</p> <p>The SKSD has presented a vision for reform and credible approach to improving student achievement. They are aware of the need for differentiating instruction, particularly for English Language Learners, but need more strategies for working with these students to accelerate and deepen their learning and improve their achievement. Some reforms are in place now, with additional strategies planned for future implementation. This response has earned eight (7) points.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	9

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The district listed and named the six high schools and seven feeder middle schools chosen for participation in this proposal. McKay, McNary, South, North, Roberts, and Early College High Schools as well as Claggett Creek, Houck, Leslie, Parrish, Stephens, Waldo and Whiteacker Middle Schools. It was stated that the schools were chosen due to large populations of students with "high needs, high poverty rates, without sufficient language skills...". No specific process for selection was noted. On the previous page of the application, the applicant stated that there are three SIG high schools in the district, but did not name them. It would be informative to this proposal if the strategies referred to in the SIG schools as experiencing "significant gains in student achievement results, especially in reading and math" would be used in the schools chosen as participating schools.

All elements of Table A2 (Applicant's Approach to Implementation) were completed satisfactorily. A point value of nine (9) was awarded for this section (A)(2) as the applicant responded to the requested information. One (1) point was deducted for lack of discussion regarding the process used for determining participating schools.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)

10

7

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has provided most, but not all of the required components of a high-quality plan.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)

10

7

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(A)(4)(a): The Salem-Keizer School District (SKSD) completed the Performance on summative assessments table (A)(4)(a) as required. The summative assessments utilized are the Oregon Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (OAKS) and the Grade 7 District Writing Assessment. The district set goals of three to four percentage points growth annually in reading and mathematics in grades six through eight and grade eleven; and in writing in grades seven and eleven. These goals are "ambitious yet achievable".

(A)(4)(b): The applicant completed the (A)(4)(b) Decreasing achievement gaps table as required. Goals for decreasing the achievement gap are set for middle school grades six through eight in reading and mathematics as well as grade eleven. Decreasing the achievement gap goals for writing are set for grades seven and eleven. Each participating school's goals are then charted individually. The decreasing achievement goals vary between one and five percentage points per year, depending on the area (economically disadvantaged, English Language Learners, Special Education students) and the school. These goals are "ambitious yet achievable".

(A)(4)(c): The district completed the (A)(4)(c) Graduation rates table as required. The graduation growth rate is set for a minimum of 2.3% per year. Unfortunately, these percentages of growth, while perhaps achievable, are not ambitious for the three subgroups, as no subgroups' goal reaches 75% by the end of 2016. These graduation rate goals are "achievable, but not ambitious".

(A)(4)(d): The applicant completed the (A)(4)(d) College enrollment table as required. The district does not have its own data regarding college-going graduates, thus they used statewide data, and then set their district goals based on that data. The goals presented by the end of the grant period are as follows: 9.1% for economically disadvantaged students, 8.9% for English Language Learners and 15.5% for Special Education students. An explanation for the higher percentage in growth goal for special Education students versus the other two categories of students would have been enlightening. In addition, since college enrollment (as defined in this notice on page 88) includes enrollment in public two-year/community colleges, ambitious goals for economically disadvantaged students and English Language Learners would be higher than 9.1% and 8.9% respectively. The college enrollment goals for these two groups are "achievable, but not ambitious".

Overall, the LEA-wide vision and goals to improve student learning and performance and increased equity demonstrates ambitious yet achievable annual goals. However, as noted above, the subgroup goals for graduation are not ambitious, nor are the college enrollment goals for the economically disadvantaged and English Language Learner subgroups. As a result, this response is awarded 7 points.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	13

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(B)(1)(a)

Seven middle schools and six high schools in the Salem-Keizer School District (SKSD) have been chosen to participate in this proposal. According to the applicant, five of the participating middle schools have made reading and mathematics gains over the last four years. Included are graphs charting these successes. There is no mention of increasing equity in learning and teaching (closing any achievement gaps in target areas) at the middle school level.

At the high school level, a number of programs focused on interventions that will assist in closing achievement gaps are listed, including graduation coaches, sophomore connections, summer transition programs, expanded childcare capacity, and AVID mentors from the AVID program. It would appear that all eight SKSD high schools participate in some or all of these programs. Clarification is needed as to which programs are functioning at the six participating high schools and how long they have been in existence. The graph indicating impressive increased high school reading achievement on the statewide assessment from the 2008-09 school year to the 2011-12 school year, shows the closing of a 5% percent gap to 1% (net 4%) over this four-year period.

Drop out rates are declining and both the 4- and 5-year graduation rates are increasing in the district.

(B)(1)(b)

SKSD has achieved significant reading and mathematics gains in McKay, Roberts and Early College High Schools. While the reading gains touted ranged from 13 percentage points (McKay) to 33 percentage points (Roberts), it appears that a portion of these gains include the state's change from testing reading in the tenth grade to the eleventh grade in 2010. The district honestly reported this change in the narrative accompanying Graph 3 – Statewide Assessments – High School Reading, in the section under High School Successes in section (3)(1)(a). Nonetheless, there are gains in reading to be reported and the gains in mathematics at the three high schools are also strong. While the district included Early College High School, it is not clear if this school would be considered a “persistently lowest-achieving school” as defined in the notice and required in section (3)(1)(b).

(B)(1)(c)

The district uses a combination of district formative assessments, district interim assessments (twice a year) and state summative assessment to inform teaching and learning. Along with the State published District and School Report Cards, the district publishes an annual report, Progress Toward Success, in an effort to share achievement and other data with the parental and broader communities.

SKSD has demonstrated a clear track record of success in the schools it has cited. Some questions remain as to how much reading the reading gains are at the high schools cited and there is no mention of closing achievement gaps at the middle school level. As a result, this section receives 13 points.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)

5

5

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The Adopted General Fund School Budgets for each of the 13 participating schools are located in Appendix 19. Actual personnel salaries at the school level for teachers and instructional staff are listed as well as actual non-personnel expenditures. They are listed under General Instruction, Special Instruction and Support Services in each school's budget. The full five points are awarded.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)

10

10

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The Salem-Keizer School District (SKSD) is fortunate to be in a state that has passed several bills in the State legislature that support and moves forward many of the big issues surrounding school reform. Senate Bills 1581, 290, 252 and House Bill 3474 all place SKSD in a unique position to implement, with authority, the reforms, programs, strategies and district and school level changes required by this proposal.

The State Board of Education adopted the Common Core State Standards and in addition, the Governor has required Achievement Compact plans from each district which require annual achievement goals AND the closing of achievement gaps at the district and state levels. The 40-40-20 formula for graduating students to represent 40% attending four-year institutions, 40% attending two-year institutions and 20% ready for college and work/career is one of the many substantial reforms now in place statewide that will provide support for this SKSD initiative.

In light of this gubernatorial and legislative support, the full ten (10) points are awarded.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)

10

6

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant met with the heads of the two collective bargaining units, the Salem-Keizer Education Association and the Association of Salem Keizer Education Support Professionals during the writing phase of this proposal for input and comment on the draft proposal.

Fourteen (14) Letters of Support are listed in Appendix 20. Included are letters from the City Mangers of Salem and Keizer, the Salem-Keizer Education Foundation, Salem-Keizer Coalition for Equality, Oregon Department of Education, three university and community college partners, and the Salem Area Chamber of Commerce, among others.

It appears that 1) no mention of local parent association groups was made regarding announcement nor input to this proposal, 2) the Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), often referred to in other parts of this proposal, are not mentioned as having input (it is not stated the PLCs are synonymous with school leadership teams who provided input on school focus and priorities); and, 3) there is also no mention of student input.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)

5

2

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The components of a high quality plan are: key goals, activities, timelines, deliverables and parties responsible.

The applicant offers a theory of action, "if we personalize students learning experiences through deeper and more engaging instruction, student achievement will increase", which can be rephrased as their goal: *to personalize students learning experiences through deeper and more engaging instruction, resulting in increased student achievement*. An analysis of needs is presented: ELL student support, improved writing skills, improved math and science instruction within the STEM career track. Many current and future strategies for reaching the stated goals and meeting stated needs are noted. These include: program schools for ELLs, CTE program options, STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering & Mathematics) academies, project-based learning and teaching, educational technology, extending and redefining learning time, focused and timely interventions, increased rigor and access to advanced courses, and focused embedded professional development for professional staff.

However, some key components of a high quality plan are missing, such as timelines, deliverables (improved student achievement?) and persons responsible.

Without those missing components, the response does not meet the requirements of a high quality plan.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	15
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
This criterion calls for a high quality plan that is comprised of the following components: goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties.		
The Salem-Keizer School District (SKSD) has both initiated some and planned additional programs, strategies and activities that will result in increased student achievement and graduation rates, deep learning experiences, college- and career-readiness skills, as well as high-quality strategies that work with high-need students if they are implemented fully and with integrity. Missing from the discussion of these proposed programs are timelines, responsible parties and in some cases, deliverables.		
Examples of these programs and activities are:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Goal: Personalized Education Plans (future) for each student starting in grade six, with annual review and refining through grade twelve. Career specialists in schools as well as career centers will provide guidance to students. The applicant proposes this program will be delivered through advisory groups or as a separate elective course. 		

This is an important and worthy goal. However, clarification is needed regarding adequate planning for delivery of this program. Both advisories and electives create implications and repercussions for programming, scheduling, teacher availability and suitability (for elective courses), etc.

The missing component of a high-quality plan for this goal, Personalized Education Plans (PEPs), is the timeline. No start or phase in for the PEPs is stated.

- Goal: Development of a College- and Career-Readiness Framework to be implemented at each school in the district. While this represents another worthy enterprise for the district, and is discussed in an earlier section of the proposal, as part of a high-quality plan, again, components are missing.

Missing: timelines and responsible parties.

- Goal: A blueprint that clearly articulates the least-restrictive model on the district's continuum of special education services. This blueprint will be piloted 2012-13 at the secondary level with implementation slated for 2013-14.

Missing high-quality plan components: those who are responsible for developing the blueprint (perhaps a committee) and the activities they will undertake to complete the blueprint.

- Goal: Expansion of the Data Warehouse. The Salem-Keizer School District's four-year development of their Data Warehouse is impressive. They collect, and teachers have daily access to: student data collected from classrooms (grades, formative assessments), schools (attendance, behavior and alignment to graduation requirements), and the state (state assessment scores). Expansion of the Data Warehouse will include the development of online teacher dashboards that will be individualized to showcase specific classroom goals for each course taught by each teacher.

Missing components: Timeline and those responsible for the work to expand the capabilities of the Data Warehouse. While it could be assumed that those who have already worked on the Data Warehouse would continue, a statement to that effect would have provided useful clarification.

The applicant has included a variety of goals, programs, strategies and activities that have great potential. However, as noted, some parts of a 'high-quality plan' are omitted.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)

20

13

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The Salem-Keizer School District (SKSD) does have an overall approach to teaching that will assist educators as they seek to improve their instructional knowledge and techniques that will allow for eventual full implementation of personalized teaching and learning resulting in increased numbers of students graduating from high school being college- and career ready. The applicant states that its plan for implementing college and career ready standards for all students is anchored within the implementation of the Common Core State Standards.

They cite a number of ongoing and future trainings, policies and strategies that they believe will support teachers and principals individually and collectively that respond to this criterion. Some of the more promising are: planned course statements that describe content standards and learning objectives, assessment methods, and alignment to career related learning standards; the requirement that students take Algebra I in eighth grade; open computer labs for students and parents after school hours and on weekends; content area instructional coaches; and, providing professional development on effective use of the Data Warehouse for staff and PLCs as a team.

While these are worthwhile endeavors and will most certainly increase personalization for students and likewise increase their academic achievement when fully implemented, once again, there are often no timelines, deliverables or identification of who will be responsible for the development and/or implementation of these programs/strategies.

To their credit, the writers did acknowledge that having 8th graders take Algebra I would, "require a restructuring of the mathematics curriculum and sequence at the secondary level". However, it would seem that preparing 8th graders for Algebra I would need to start earlier than at the secondary level. Likewise, planning professional development to enable increased and more effective use of their Data Warehouse, would be money well invested. Regarding the strategy of adding content-specific instructional coaches in the areas of mathematics, science and English language arts, the addition of ESL and ELL specialists

as instructional coaches would also improve the teaching and learning process for teachers and learners in SKSD.

The applicant has shared several good strategies for moving the teaching and leading process forward for the district (although there is little discussion of principals' or central office staff roles). Subsequent planning for each strategy in a step-by-step manner will help ensure accurate and successful implementation of these proposed strategies and programs.

It appears that there is no evidence criterion (C)(2)(d), a high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals including in hard-to-staff schools, subjects, and specialty areas was addressed.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	12
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Salem-Keizer School District (SKSD), the second-largest in the state serving over 40,000 students, appears to be staffed with enough personnel at the senior levels (comprising the Superintendent's cabinet) to oversee implementation of this proposal. A project manager will be hired who will work with various committees (and hopefully outside agencies that provide services to high-need populations and are not mentioned in this section) and develop implementation plans with specific milestones and timelines. Within those timelines, the project manager will develop monthly, quarterly, and annual reporting structures that will correlate with specific school and district level goals and objectives.</p> <p>The applicant states that leadership teams are a priority in the district, and has set guidelines for membership and actions for these teams. Their importance rose to a presentation regarding the need for, and usefulness of, leadership teams to the schools and district; as evidenced by their inclusion in this year's strategic plan (number eight).</p> <p>Regarding flexibility, the SKSD refers to utilizing a "loose-tight" balance arrangement with district schools that allows the district to set priorities which must be followed by all schools (tight), while allowing schools flexibility in determining how they will support district-wide priorities and programs (loose).</p> <p>The district states that their "guiding principle is 'practice informs policy'", in reference to secondary teachers' not currently using proficiency-based teaching and learning. It appears that the district has come to understand the need for utilizing the proficiency model and shares plans for various levels of implementation at McKay, South Salem and McNary high schools. The staff at two schools, Roberts and Early College, currently utilizes a logarithmic progression to reflect the acquisition of new skills or concepts, which are entered into an electronic grade book.</p> <p>The applicant states that curriculum standards, instructional, state standards and Common Core State Standards are all currently aligned. Current units of study provide guidance for general education and ELL students. Current Planned Course Statements (PCS) for high school are in place and will be revised to align with Common Core State Standards (CCSS). New units of study to be developed include Special Education, At Risk, and Talented and Gifted students and will be aligned to curriculum maps to guide <u>proficiency-based teacher instruction</u>. These newly CCSS aligned, proficiency-based curriculum maps will be developed and implemented by 2013-14.</p> <p>Plans for middle school curriculum course alignment are being developed during this 2012-13 school year and will be aligned to support the district goal of providing a "seamless" system of college and career preparation in grades six through twelve. A proficiency-based grading system is currently being developed by instructional staff for the same grades in math, language arts and science for pilot implementation also this year.</p> <p>Overall, SKSD has or plans to have in place practices, policies and rules that will facilitate their programs for personalizing instruction and learning. Their weakest areas are in proficiency-based teaching, learning and assessment and assuring that resources and instructional practices are fully accessible to all students, particularly students with disabilities and English learners.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	5

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This criterion requires the district and school infrastructures support personalized learning in various ways. The applicant states the web-based portal that provides parental access to student data will be updated with more comprehensive data (no timeline). In a response in a previous section, (C)(2)(b), SKSD discusses two promising outreach strategies to parents and community, Open Labs and providing free internet access to parents and students.

Data currently loaded in the Data Warehouse provides interoperable views. Additional data such as human resources and budget data will be integrated into the Data Warehouse system (no stated timeline).

It appears that additional responses are needed for (D)(2)(a) and (D)(2)(b).

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	10

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Criterion (E)(1) calls for “a rigorous continuous improvement process”. The Salem-Keizer School District (SKSD) proposes the following implementation monitoring continuous improvement activities:

- A district-/community-wide stakeholders’ advisory committee will be formed to guide and oversee implementation of the project as proposed;
- Under the direction of the advisory committee and project manager, monthly, quarterly and annual reporting structures will be developed and provided to the Superintendent and advisory committee for review;
- Within the ongoing Supervision Cycle K-12, Level Directors are responsible for monitoring the progress of schools in raising student achievement through school improvement plans aligned to the District Strategic Plan. This comprehensive monitoring/review cycle includes: “monitoring school improvement plans, Title 1 plans, budgets, professional development activities, staff evaluations and effectiveness, implementation of instructional coaching, data reviews and analysis, stakeholder engagement, and Strategic Plan initiative implementation”. District Level Directors who currently oversee the middle and high schools and conduct these monthly school visitations, will add monitoring of this project to their duties in a similar, monthly fashion;
- Technical assistance, professional development resources, and tools for implementation will be provided by content area and support departments; and,
- Principals will include progress monitoring of the project during their mid-year and end-of-year Academic Conferences.

The district-/community-wide stakeholders’ advisory committee has the potential to be of great service to this project and the district as a whole, if it is managed with integrity.

Incorporating the monitoring of this project into the current district system/cycle of school-level monitoring and review represents wise and appropriate use of district office personnel.

Providing technical assistance to teachers and in buildings will always be necessary, to assist with both new and old technologies.

These monitoring activities are sound, as well as inclusive, and will provide sufficient data regarding growth, improvement (or lack thereof) allowing for adjustments to be considered and implemented.

The applicant needs to be aware that thus far, parental, student and community involvement has come across in this application as an afterthought. There is only one sentence regarding the stakeholders’ advisory committee specific to this response. No details regarding which (community) groups would be considered for membership, nor the process that may be used for engendering their support and participation on this committee is presented. In order for this proposal to be implemented fully and successfully, and for sustained change to occur, significant outreach must be conducted on an ongoing basis, monitored and modified as needed so that the voices of the people whose lives will be affected most by this effort will be heard. Educators have much to learn from the people they serve. Additional training and development for parents, community members and students may be required (and should be considered) for those unaccustomed (culturally and otherwise) to expressing their thoughts and opinions in a public forum.

The continuous improvement process presented is reasonable. More thought must be given to the process for membership on the stakeholders' advisory committee as noted above.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)

5

5

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The Salem-Keizer School District has a district strategic communications plan which includes goals, strategies, tactics and evaluation. The four communication goals for 2012 are listed:

1. Help improve student achievement through effective communications;
2. Build stronger leadership by opening more channels of information sharing;
3. Increase public engagement by providing more opportunities for our community to become involved in our schools and become unofficial spokespeople for our students; and,
4. Continue to support the district's infrastructure and non-instructional departments in our overall effort to increase student achievement.

These communications goals are evidence that the district understood the value and importance of strong communications throughout the district, both internally and externally, prior to the development of this proposal.

Additionally, the Superintendent holds monthly information-sharing meetings with staff associations, the Teacher Communication and Classified Communication Groups and the Professional Action Committee for Education. These are in addition to public forums conducted for external stakeholders.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)

5

3

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The Salem-Keizer School District (SKSD) has provided "ambitious yet achievable" performance measures on the tables for which they have data that is provided by the state. However, it appears that some effort could have been made to determine some data points for performance measures for which the SKSD would have had to determine for themselves. For example, while SKSD "does not have the ability to match student data with teachers over multiple years", for the required highly effective and effective tables for teachers and principals, they could have run the data for one middle or high school grade and/or subject. They did not say that there was no data regarding classification of teachers as highly effective or effective. If that was/is the case, then the matching of students to teachers understandably would not have been possible.

Another example is with regard to districtwide data presented for students in grades six indicating students on-track to college and career readiness as measured by grade six student attendance at 90% or higher. The reviewer wonders how SKSD tracks school attendance for state funding. Even if state funding is delivered based on districtwide attendance, the SKSD Data Warehouse should be tracking attendance for each student and should be able to be manipulated to aggregate attendance by grade and school. If the district was unable to do any of this tracking on their own, a statement suggesting that they tried to disaggregate the districtwide data would have shown both good faith effort and acknowledgement of data points in need of inclusion into the Data Warehouse.

It is noted that only four of the six participating high schools' data was submitted on the grade 9-12 table, item (c), utilizing CTE enrollment as a performance measure. (If the alternative schools are not included on purpose, this should have been noted.)

On the grades 4-8 and 9-12 tables, important items (c) and (e) respectively were not addressed.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)

5

3

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant plans to develop a comprehensive management plan to track all performance measures by school with the assistance of district partners with expertise in program review and evaluation such as the EPIC Center and David Conley at the University of Oregon and Education Northwest. They also plan to delineate quantifiable measurable activities and indicators for each of the strategies, activities and programs they have proposed. This response lacked some elements of a thoughtful plan for evaluation.

For example, plans should include what will be done with the measure of a data point that is not moving on target or is

moving backwards. They should also discuss how the program evaluation of an individual who is not progressing in his or her work (while others in this same position/measure at other schools are progressing) will be handled.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	10
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>While the applicant has presented a sound budget, with all required narratives and tables completed, it appears that an additional narrative connection for some of the proposed program positions to be funded would have been helpful.</p> <p>The Salem-Keizer School District has made the decision, based on past success, to hire additional curriculum specialists in the areas of instructional technology, language arts, math, science and social studies. Concerns still remain regarding the possible advantages that, in light of the growing diversity within the Salem-Keizer population, hiring additional English language specialists to work with teachers, students and parents would also have been a wise expenditure for the district in forwarding its goal to personalize learning for all students.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	7
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides a narrative for sustainability of the program's goals past the fourth year of funded implementation. The concept of a Weighted Success Factor (WSF) based on successful implementation of the programs, strategies and activities of the proposal is a product of review of other districts' similar formulas by the Salem-Keizer district staff.</p> <p>The WSF criteria will align with the proposal priorities and incorporate the following key areas with the its associated "weight" in percentage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School vision and Alignment with District Strategic Plan (15%) • Record of student success and conditions of sustainability (45%) • College and career ready alignment (20%) • Continuous Improvement / Quality Assurance Model (15%) • Competitive Preference Priority – A Culture of Success (5%) <p>According to the applicant, this WSF will be phased in over three years, with the results utilized in year four of the grant. This criterion requires a high-quality plan for sustainability. There appears to be no discussion in this section regarding sustainability.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	8
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>While the Salem-Keizer School District (SKSD) provides guidance counseling services such as Second Steps and the Great Body Shop, programs focused on building student self-esteem and the reduction of at risk behaviors at the elementary and middle school levels, the district also has a number of ongoing partnerships and programs that extend the "reach" of the district to provide needed services and programs to students and families. The most prominent organization partnering with SKSD is the Salem-Keizer Education Foundation. According to the applicant, the Salem-Keizer Education Foundation will use a five-pronged approach to meet the goals set out by this Race to the Top proposal: Parent University, Center for Student Success, Enrichment Academy and Community Schools, STEM Academy (Science, Technology, Engineering and Math), and Parent-Teacher Home Visits.</p>		

A more detailed response to item (4) regarding the integration of education and other services (e.g., services that address social-emotional, and behavioral needs, acculturation for immigrants and refugees) for participating students, would have been beneficial. For example, the district cites, "Community partners such as the Marion and Polk Counties Commission on Families and Children, the Salem-Keizer Education Foundation, Salem and Keizer law enforcement agencies, Salem and Keizer health departments, Catholic Community Services, and the Salem-Keizer Coalition for Equality, all collaborate to support students and families that are in need of specialized and dedicated support." However, the examples offered only note the same two previously discussed organizations, the Salem-Keizer Education Foundation and the Salem-Keizer Coalition for Equality. No mention is made of any of the programs provided by the health departments, Catholic Community Services, or the law enforcement agencies, for example. Information on the collaborative programs these community partners provide would have offered a fuller perspective of the how the district meets the social-emotional and behavioral needs of the families and students in participating schools.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has met Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments through a thorough presentation of goals and proposed programs, strategies and activities that they have designed to personalize the teaching and learning process for all students in the thirteen participating schools.

Total	210	157
-------	-----	-----

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	15

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has proposed substantive programs for funding in this optional budget supplement. All of the proposed programs build on personalization of teaching and learning and college-and career readiness.



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0375OR-2 for Salem-Keizer School District 24J

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

A.1

The applicant has set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that is in director correlation with district and state initiatives, and provides a clear and credible approach as evidenced by the following examples:

- the provision of individualized, prescriptive student learning plans that help support the shift from curriculum-focused education to learner-focuses education
- providing resources that support learning including technology that enables interactive and innovative teaching interfaces, and provides in-class, extended-day, and at-home opportunities for instruction
- the availability and use of immediate and transparent data systems to guide teaching and learning for use by all stakeholders
- job embedded, sustained, and measured opportunities for professional development that moves beyond the sit and get approach, and involves instructional coaches assisting data-driven instructional strategies
- improving college and career readiness by increasing the number of students enrolled and successfully completing advance placement and/or dual enrollment courses, implementing career pathways which incorporate STEM initiatives at targeted grade levels, and increasing the number of community-based or higher educational partnerships through job shadowing opportunities or paid internships

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)

10

10

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

A.2.

The applicant clearly demonstrates an approach to implementing its reform proposal that will support high-quality LEA-level and school level implementation of that proposal

As evidence the applicant has adopted a strategic plan that mirrors the RTTT-D principals. For example, SKSD has to move classroom instruction and assessment to a deeper level of the Common Core Standards. As a result, this can prepare students for career and /or post-secondary education after graduation. The development and implementation of this plan was a buy into system which included teachers, principals, counselors and curriculum specialists to support career and college readiness relative to the four domains, where the gaps exist and what work needs to be deepened to close the achievement gap. Furthermore, as evidence the applicant has implemented a K-12 alignment. In this initiative, the applicant is working with the local medical and infant programs and pre-schools serving the SKSD communities to identify 0-5 year olds who are not on target for success in the first years of elementary school and on the opposite end as well, the applicant is working with partnerships with post secondary institutions to ensure transitions form SKSD to state colleges and universities.

- a. Salem-Keizer School District operates 66 schools including 43 elementary schools, 11 middle schools, 8 high schools, and 4 charter schools. Over 60% of the district's 40,500 students live in poverty based on the number receiving Federal Free and Reduced Meal program. Based upon the number of students receiving free and reduced meals indicates a need. Twenty-six schools in the district qualify for Title 1, which is approximately one-third.

Weakness: The applicant does not present how it determined which schools would be included in the reform initiative.

- b. As evidenced in (A)(2) Applicant's Approach to Implementation/School Demographics Chart indicates that 7 middle schools and 6 high schools are participants in the initiative. the six high schools are McKay, McNary, South, North, Roberts, and Early College. Middle school includes Clalgggett Creek, Houck, Leslie, Parrish, Stephens, Waldo and Whitetaker. As evidence schools were selected on the basis of high needs, high poverty rates, hihg number of students without sufficient English language skills, and students from among a range of ethnic groups.
- c. The total number of students participating is 14,571. The number of students identified as low-income is 10,380. The total number of high needs is 11,398. Participating students are taught by a combined total of 1,075. Also it is evidenced that the total number of low-income in LEA or Consortium is 26,224. A foot note indicated that for calculation of graduates and dropouts, the state uses net enrollment for alternative schools, not October 1 enrollment; but for simplicity and comparability, Early College High School and Roberts High School Show October 1 enrollment

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>A clearly defined plan is presented to demonstrate how the reform proposal was implemented and has potential to improve outcomes for all of the students in the consortium. The plan described how SKSD has a proven track record of scaling up best and effective practices for all schools. As evidence, for example, in addition to SIG schools, the district implemented a High School Graduation Initiative (HSGI) grant, and a Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) grant. All three grants have already provided proven and effective practices that have been implemented in other schools. Summer academies and especially freshman academies/camps have been adopted by many of our schools as a way to help students smoothly transition to high school and be on track with their peers. In- school intervention classes and labs have become the norm for helping struggling students. furthermore, both middle and high schools implemented common school schedules. As evidence the decisions for the implementation of common school schedules were driven by a core set of values which included all students have equal access to grade level core classes, as well as, electives; collaboration between staff and students, interventions are built into the school day; equal access to courses across all schools; rigor being valued (all students can achieve at high levels; and mobility should not impact a student's education.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>A.4</p> <p>The applicant outlines how the applicant's vision is likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity as demonstrated by ambitious yet achievable annual goals.</p> <p>a. The applicant outlines some ambitious goals for performance on summative assessments in the participating school district. Performance on summative assessments, individualized instruction, and extended time for learning will assist school leaders and educators as they identify students who are in need of remediation or enrichment opportunities. As leaders and educators become more aware of specific areas in which each student needs support, students will have multiple opportunities and pathways to demonstrate mastery resulting in improved performance in all areas on summative assessments through the Individualized Learning Plan as indicated in vision for the reform; thus attaining predicted increases (goals). Additionally, training opportunities designed to increase teacher and leader effectiveness will increase the capacity at each school to support individualized learning initiatives. College and career readiness initiatives will ensure that students are prepared as they leave school, but they will also provide opportunities for students to choose learning paths that are based on their career and/or college interests.</p> <p>b. The applicant outlines ambitious and attainable goals for decreasing achievement gaps in the targeted service area for academic performance. Achievement gaps will be decreased through data analysis and individual student support and specified in the reform vision. Achievement Gaps will be measured by the state of Oregon and reported through the state-determined Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) Accountability Data. Additionally, the gap targets are determined by calculating the percent difference between an identified subgroup and all other students not included in that particular subgroup. The subgroup's achievement is compared with the All Students group and the difference is the Gap Target. Growth is measured in annual increase in achievement level. The subgroups identified are: Economically Disadvantaged (students identified as qualifying for free/reduced lunch), Limited English Proficient, and Students with Disabilities. These subgroups are compared with their counterparts (Non-Economically Disadvantaged, Non-Limited English Proficient, and Non-disabled students). All groups are shown as making increases.</p> <p>c. The applicant outlines ambitious and attainable goals for increasing graduation rates. The percent of Growth for the 2013 Graduation Rate was calculated by the Oregon Department of Education. The following growth percentages were used to determine the target graduation rate for 2013, and for the rest of the school years' goals. The growth rate is 2.3%. However, the growth rate is higher for the subgroups and varies depending on how much growth they need to make to meet 90% in 2025. Ninety percent earning a regular diploma allows for 10% earning a GED or other diploma such as modified or extended, but the completion would be 100% These goals are one year ahead of Oregon's</p>		

required achievement compact goals. The college enrollment data is provided by the state-at the distric level only. The most recent year of data is 2009-2010. This information came from the Oregon Department of Education. The goals are those SKSD set in the achievement compact, based on the growth needed to meet 40/40/20 goals in 2025. As evidenced in a chart, goals of increase are adequate in terms of baseline data presented.

d. The applicant outlines ambitious and attainable goals for increasing graduation rates. College enrollment is calculated as the ratio between college-enrolled students and their graduating cohort. The applicant states for SY 2010-11 college enrollment is calculated as follows:

- (College enrollment SY 2010-11) = Number of SY 2008-09 graduates enrolled in a higher-education institution during the 16months after graduation
- (College enrollment rate) = (College enrollment SY 2010-11)÷(Cohort Population, e.g. total number of SY 2008-09 graduates)*100
- As evidence, SKSD has made a commitment to creating a college-going culure and insturional supports in all secondary schools by implementing AVID. As a result, the program is designed to put students on a college-bound track by focusing on rigor and equity. Teachers are trained to promote rigor which enganges students in critical thinking and problem solving strategies. In the AVID program, students are exposed to colleges and careers which creates the vision and opens possibilities to the options beyond high school.

Weakness: Optiona A(4)e Postsecondary degree attainment .As evidence there was no baseline data given. The information provided did not present any merit.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	12

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

B.1

The applicant details information to demonstrate its efforts to advance student learning and achievement within the last four years.

- a. Based upon the applicant's statement that state standards and assessment proficiency levels for all grade levels at five participating middle schools showed increases in reading on the state OAKS assessment in the four years between the 2007-2008 and 2010-2011 academic years; however, middle school math gains across the five participating schools show need for continuing improvement. The applicant demonstrates some reasonable success in the past four years in advancing student learning and achievement for schools participating in the reform initiative. Significant decline in proficiency levels is reflected on data charts for the Consortium reporting scores from 2007 to 2011 in some areas, as is the ability to advance student learning. The applicant presented interventions that contributed the increases. The applicant states the drop-out rates and 4-year and 5-year graduation rates showed evidence of good improvement; however, the percentage points had dropped to less than one percentage point difference from the state average by 2010-2011.

Weakness: The applicant does not elaborate on the drastic decline in 8th Math at Houck Middle School.

- b. The applicant states there are four School Improve Grant (SIG) schools in SKSD including three high schools and one elementary school. The SIG resources allow these schools to implement ambitious and appropriate services to help raise achievement. Some services and reforms include:

- Reassignment at each school when warranted including principal – Professional development models including instruction coaches
- Curriculum and instruction review and alignment
- Focused interventions during the day which include removing student distractions
- Increased student engagement and motivation
- Parent and community engagement and support
- District-wide data
- District and School Report Cards
- Annual Progress toward Success Report

The applicant stated that some SIG schools have experienced success and have been removed from the title of SIG designation.

- c. The applicant outlines clearly defined practices to make student performance data available to students, educators, and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services. Practices supporting this premise include:

- State test (Oregon Assessment of Knowledge and Skills).
- District wide assessments in reading and math (common formative assessment).
- Classroom work like work samples to provide those multiple check points
- District formative assessment
- District interim assessment (twice a year) and
- State summative assessment

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>B.2</p> <p>The applicant clearly demonstrates how Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments, including making public, by school, actual school-level expenditures for regular K-12 instruction, instructional support, pupil support, and school administration. AS evidence resources available to the district flow from the State School fund through a formula that takes into account local property taxes and state general fund dollars allocated to K12 education in Oregon.. For example school level instructional funding is allocated based on per pupil numbers or school size. These instructional allocations are tracked at the school level through accounting software. School level allocations follow written guidelines for acceptable expenditures. School and district funds are audited yearly for acceptable expenses and following local accounting procedures. Comparability of local, state and federal dollars is monitored for compliance. All personnel including administrative positions are monitored yearly for staffing equivalents between Title I and Non-Title I schools. Financial reports are presented to the various governing bodies in public forums. As evidence, additionally, the district receives federal and state grants as well as other local revenue. then requirements are determined throughout the district, such as staffing levels based on approved teacher-student ratios.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

B.3

The applicant presents evidence of successful conditions and sufficient autonomy requirements to implement the personalized learning environments described in the applicant's proposal. For example the applicant adopted the Common Core Standards and extended further in statewide reform with the Governor's initiative to require Achievement Compact plans with annual performance goals for all students. More importantly, the implementation of key reforms and innovations in teacher and administrator evaluation frameworks has been adopted. Successful conditions of the state's reform agenda encompasses implementation of rigorous college and career-ready standards in response to the need to aim higher in expectations for student learning; expanding the state's rich data system by joining with twenty-six state to develop summative assessments in English language arts and mathematics to align with Common Core State Standards; and capturing the power of a highly trained workforce through alternative pathways to certification. The school district superintendent, chair of the school district board and the exclusive bargaining representatives and Oregon's history of education reform and innovation provide SKSD the authority and autonomy to enact policies, initiatives, and priorities that will further enhance the personalization of student learning while engaging parents and the community in shaping and informing new and emerging practices in education today.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)

10

10

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

B.4

The applicant demonstrates meaningful stakeholder engagement in the development of the proposal and meaningful stakeholder support for the proposal. SKSD teachers and support staff are represented by two collective bargaining units (SKEA and ASKESP). A meeting was held with the SKSD assistant superintendent, President and Vice President of SKEA and the President of ASKESP during the writing phase of the proposal to solicit input. Once the draft was completed, both groups were given the opportunity to review and provide input. Outreach was expanded to the community partners which included Salem-Keizer Education Foundation, Salem Chamber, Salem-Keizer Coalition for Equality, Catholic Community Services, Oregon Department of Education, and university and community college partners. With school administrators describing the available opportunity demonstrates appeal for support, allowed the applicant to gain information on prioritized needs for major reforms for the district. Additionally, local teacher association leaders and city mayors and city managers provide support to the reform initiative.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)

5

5

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

B.5

The applicant provides a high quality plan that addresses the current status in implementing personalized learning environments and the logic behind the reform proposal. This is evidenced by clearly defined personalized student learning strategies that aids student in the learning process. The SKSD has to ensure that students have the basic and technical skills necessary to effectively engage in rigorous challenging learning. Those student learning strategies include but not limited to program schools for ELL's, instructional coaching, curriculum alignment and articulation, CTE Program Options, STEM academics, project-based learning, teaching educational technology, extending and redefining learning time, focused and timely interventions, increased rigor and access to advanced courses, and focused embedded professional development for professional staff.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	15
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
C.1		

The applicant outlines a strong plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. As evidence the applicant has implemented various strategies to personalize learning to ensure student proficiency in college and career readiness skills. For example students can engage in a process that allows self-reflection, interest inventories, and goal setting. As a result, starting at grade 6 students can develop a plan that can be reviewed and refined grades 7 through 12. Furthermore, as evidence career and college curriculum are designed and implemented to support students in grades 6-12. However, this strategy is evidence for all students, the applicant indicates will provide extra support and targeted interventions for ELLs and economically disadvantaged students. Parents and guardians of these students will also be educated about the application process as well as the admission process. By implementing AVID for all students, SKSD can provide ongoing professional development and training to teachers on how to implement effective instructional strategies such as Critical Reading, Interactive Notebook, etc. to provide an effective and customized way of personalizing education for each student's needs and aspiration. In addition, special education students also have access to college and career ready counseling. Also, SKSD's Indian Education program has partnered with colleges and universities to prepare Native American students for college and career readiness. As evidence the colleges and universities provide writing instruction and support in order for the students to successfully complete college applications, write essays, for scholarships, and enroll in college preparation summer programs. In addition, volunteer student tutors are providing assistance in academic subject matters with an emphasis on writing and math proficiency.

Weaknesses: There was a lack of clarification of the personalized learning project. Also noted no timeline for the development of Data Warehouse.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)

20

15

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

C.2

The applicant outlines a strong plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. This is evidenced by

- new teacher and evaluation systems based on InTASC standards for teachers and ISLLC standards for administration
- implementation of graduation requirements focused on personalization of learning through an education plan and profile, proficiency based instruction, increased graduation credits in math, science, and English Language Arts
- increase for graduation through demonstrated proficiency in reading, writing, and math
- implementation of and professional development related to the Common Core Standards
- the provision of electronic instructional programs to enhance student knowledge, skills and behaviors needed to make informed decisions about post-secondary opportunities and become lifelong planners.
- continued expansion of Response-to-Intervention (RTI) models
- the provision of technology coaches to train and support teachers to use technology
- the investment of video conferencing tools such as online webinar technologies to provide mechanisms for professional (and possibly student) collaboration between schools.
- providing content instructional coaches

As evidence through standards, alignment and articulation, the implementation of the CCSS throughout the district aligns with the college and career readiness strategy and outcomes. In addition, the district has built a significant capacity in curriculum,

instruction, and assessment programs that support student learning and engagement. For example the implementation of a science course sequence has been developed in all high schools to engage students to support these implementations, and targeted interventions and support are in place. Such interventions include summer school, Saturday Academy, extended hours, early bird and late bird classes. The plan also include collecting data and professional development. As evidence, continuing to develop data collection systems and analysis along with professional development will ensure that the district's college and career readiness initiative would be aligned and implemented to the fullest. For example ongoing training in analyzing data to inform, adjust modify and tailor instruction to the needs of all students will be an ongoing need. As evidence, professional development is needed in order to determine how data analysis assists in understanding the needs and the potential of each student.

Weaknesses: In the narrative, the applicant presents good strategies, however, there are no timetable nor deliverables. There is little mention about the step by step for addressing the initiatives.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	13
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: D.1 <p>The applicant describes appropriate Local Education Agency practices and rules to help demonstrate it has a plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student the support and resources needed. Consortium districts have specified Board policies outlining the responsibility of the Directors of Schools to establish clear lines of authority. Each district has an organizational chart which is also posted on the system website. Policy and organizational chart existence are both evidenced in the Appendix. Each district has sufficient supervisory level staff designated to supervise and collaborate with school-level leadership. Leadership of consortium members appears to be both collegial and participative. In that collaboration occurring between teachers and administrators is described that will ensure a coherent approach to learning is in place. Consortium district schools have been represented by local association groups and have contributed individual letters of support. Signatures of superintendents, school board members, and county and city mayors showed authoritative support in their signed application. Letters of support from local business and industry show support and recognition of the districts' commitment to reform and implication for the community. System-level leadership teams promote an infrastructure that promotes learning. For example, the applicant cites Professional Learning Communities Leaders; instructional coaches' cohort; RTTT teams; teacher mentors; data-interpretation coaches; parent-engagement providers (e.g. Title I Parent Center & Family Resource Center); and technology coaches. These teams can provide research-based and effective instructional support, as well as monitoring for fidelity of implementation. Further the applicant demonstrates efforts that give students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple ways. For example, alternative formats provide flexibility in scheduling and in delivery of instruction, and delivered via technology, and often times provides flexibility in scheduling, based upon student mastery of skills within certain courses (i.e., virtual, credit recovery). The applicant states resources and instructional practices in the districts are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English language learners, to include technology, staffing, course offerings, and access to high quality professional development.</p> <p>Weakness: Information is not presented to determine if policies or rules give students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, instead of the amount of time spent on a topic which would adhere to strategies outlined for Individual Learning Plans and opportunities for learning. Additional, reference is not made to practices or policies governing the provision of learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and accessible to students.</p> <p>A description would support the collegial and participative framework that allows collaborative decisions to be made.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	8
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: D.2 <p>The applicant describes Local Education Agency and school infrastructure to help demonstrate that it has a plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student the support and resources needed. Local Education Agency staffing and resource are described as being appropriate to help ensure appropriate</p>		

implementation of the reform plan. As evidence SKSD's central office organization promotes collaboration and consistent support to students, teachers, schools and the community. In an effort to support this reform, the applicant will hire a project manager to work with the central office and advisory committee to develop extensive implementation plans which will consist of specific milestones and timelines. For example monthly, quarterly, and annual reports from schools and district level goals and objectives along with timelines. The reports will be generated to the advisory committee and the central office for review and action. These reports will be made public and published in multiple languages.

In addition, the district uses their teachers in describing practices that are the most effective in the classroom. For example, several teachers who are strong and innovative developed a set of proficiency related recommendations, to help increase consistency across the district.. With such a plan, the students have at least six classroom opportunities to demonstrate master, and more if necessary, outside of the regular class time. As a result, students are able to earn credit and progress using proficiency. For example, the development of a support class for students who were close to passing their first semester of Algebra I. Rather than earning an F and having to repeat the class, they are allowed to continue their progress toward meeting all standards and receiving an Incomplete grade into a passing letter grade, however they remain in Algebra I for the second semester and receive support to help them earn a passing grade.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	13
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>E. 1</p> <p>As evidence the applicant outlines a strong plan for a rigorous continuous improvement process by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> forming a stakeholders' advisory committee composed of students, teachers, parents, community members and organizations, business sector partners, social service providers, colleges and universities, etc. to oversee and guide the development and implementation of the proposal hiring a project manager to work with district and advisory committee to develop extensive implementation plans with specific milestones and timelines. reporting monthly, quarterly and annually school and district goals, objectives, and timelines. submitting reports to the advisory committee and central office for review and action reporting publicly on milestones in multiple languages monitoring middle and high school for progress on implementation of the strategic plan goal <p>In addition, the level directors will conduct walk throughs with the principals. As evidence the walkthroughs give first-hand information of the implementation occurring in the instructional core. This is an opportunity for the principals to share progress on school improvement supported by evidence, as well as, provide a summative evaluation of growth made over a year's span for the school and the administrator.</p> <p>Weakness: The applicant did very little about addressing how the applicant will monitor, measure, and publicly share information on the quality of its investments funded by Race to the Top.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>E.2</p> <p>The applicant describes a strong system of communication and engagement. This is evidenced in the applicant's response by holding monthly communications meetings with licensed and classified associations to discuss issues and concerns at the school and staff levels – Teacher Communication and Classified Communication Groups. Holding community forums to share information and communicate information throughout the SKSD communication. The district website is regularly used to inform the community of events and activities throughout the district. Non-traditional activities will allow districts to maintain as well as improve communication with parents and guardians. Traditional events and activities will be combined with a new emphasis</p>		

on personalizing student learning and focusing on academic achievement. Non-traditional events and programming will be used to create new relationships with the community and district. The system will also promote and utilize social media as a means to engage students, parents and the community with updates and announcements concerning students' progress and achievement. The ability of members of this consortium to promote and foster community and school relationships will be vital to ensure the success and achievement of the goals which have been established in this reform vision, as establishing clear lines of communication among all stakeholders will enhance and promote a culture that will value education and post-secondary training. Additionally, the use of websites will also enhance communication efforts with stakeholders.

External and community engagement will be supplemented with opportunities found in communication with civic organizations and other community clubs. Regular appearances with civic and community groups will allow for the district to communicate expectations and provide regular updates and progress toward the academic goals established.

Newspaper and radio programming will also be utilized to reach all stakeholders. The local papers will provide opportunities for schools to promote activities and events. Schools will be encouraged to seek and communicate academic success and to recognize outstanding achievement of students. The meeting within and outside of the district will allow district leadership to promote and communicate progress toward the components of the reform vision.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	5
--	---	---

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

E.3

The applicant outlines achievable performance measures, overall and by subgroup, with annual targets for required and applicant-proposed performance measures. In specifying performance measures, the applicant indicated that the selection of measures is guided largely by the district's state mandated Achievement Compact. The Achievement Compact holds every district in the state accountable for 40% of students earning a four-year degree, 40% of students earning and associate's degree or post high school certificate, and 20% of students earning a high school diploma or equivalent and ready to enter the workforce. The targets for each year will be utilized for planning and performance management for the RTTT reform efforts from each level of implementation - district to school to classroom. Additionally, each measure is also set and identified by each subgroup of students (race/ethnicity, poverty, students with disabilities, and English Language Learners). As evidence the goals range from 1-5 Percentage points depending on the group, the content subject, school and the extent of the achievement gap. Goals for graduation rates rely on the percent growth used for the Achievement Compact to achieve 100% graduation on the 5-year rate and 90% on the 4-year rate by 2025. It should be noted the SKSD does not have the ability to match student data with teachers over multiple years, however, SKSD is using some state funds on a current project to tie students, courses, and teachers together and to add the information to their data warehouse. The information should be available within a year. Measures that are described by the applicant are critical to making every student outcome visible and holding schools accountable for those outcomes. They are actionable at the school level meaning that school leaders, teachers and staff can use them to make changes that will have demonstrated impact.

Weakness: The number and percentage of participating students who complete and submit the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) form was unavailable. The applicant did indicate that McKay and North Salem high schools were the only schools in 2012 that provided a working FAFSA night for students and parents. McKay's participation by seniors was 30.4% and North Salem's participation was 8.8%.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3
---	---	---

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

E.4

The applicant does not present information to address the Evaluating Effectiveness of Investments. No information is present on efforts to fund activities, such as professional development and activities that employ technology and to more productively use time, staff, money, or other resources in order to improve results, through such strategies as improved use of technology, working with community partners, compensation reform, and modification of school schedule and structures.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score

(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	10
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: F.1 <p>The Salem-Keizer School District [SKSD] application asks for the qualifying amount of \$30 million in funding to support reform efforts. Additional funding from various state and local sources will support the implementation and strategies set forth in the project application. The total budget expenditures will be approximately \$32 million inclusive of local support.</p> <p>Costs associated with the development and implementation of the initiative is evident. Overall costs appear reasonable to support services. Costs are presented for all major line items. The applicant demonstrates that funds will be budgeted to provide the required services to eligible schools. For example, costs for a Project Coordinator to oversee the program are requested; costs associated with an Individualized Learning Platform to increase student achievement are requested; and costs of instructional coaches are requested to support teacher instructional development. Costs appear to be of historical and current costs, and usage. The applicant provides an adequate non-federal match for the project. Further, information is presented in a manner to justify the non-federal sources and related expenses to include descriptions and cost calculations.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	5
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: F.2 <p>The applicant outlines unique measures to sustain project goals. Consortium has developed a strategy that will rely on intensive training for teachers and leaders at initial implementation and grow steadily more independent as training continues. This plan allows for staffing instructional and technical coaching positions with teachers-on- assignment (independent contractors) initially. Their roles will be as intense support for teachers as the transformation from traditional teaching strategies to one of prescribed learning for students. Consortium districts have pledged to review each position and each program in light of success generated by results at the end of the final grant year. When the initial technology requirements and career academy equipment are in place, they commit to the ongoing maintenance and upgrades associated with maintaining these investments commensurate with need. Supporting the training on reformed instructional strategies and new technology for new personnel will be incorporated into the districts' existing efforts to ensure that all personnel are knowledgeable and up-to-date with expectations. The most likely factor in the continuation of this program is its success. The key to creating sustainability is to start planning for it at the very beginning, as demonstrated by applicant actions referenced above.</p> <p>Weaknesses: The applicant did not mention its plan after the years of the grant.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	10
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: Competitive Preference Priority <p>The applicant presents information to address the Competitive Preference Priority for the competition. Information is presented on efforts to integrate public or private resources in a partnership designed to augment the schools' resources by providing additional student and family supports to schools that address the social, emotional, or behavioral needs of the participating students. As evidence economically disadvantaged children may access one of eight Early Head Start programs that provide parenting instruction, helath and nutrition instruction, free meals, job skills training and transportation to and from the program as well as counseling parents how to access social service resources. furthermore, capacity and infrastructure exist to support expansion of the sessions at the current site, impacting those at risk teen parents currently on a waiting list. In addition, the SKSD K-12 Safety Supports which include At Risk Behaviors - Second Steps/Great Body shop, Physical and Sexual Abuse/Talk About Touch, Sudden Threat Assessment, K-12 child and Youth Health Programs. In addition, SKSD will build upon its existing model for integrating education, community and other support serviced to support the social, emotional, behavioral, and academic needs of all students by providing professional development to all participating schools' staff. To identify family and community needs climate surveys along with student and parent surveys will be conducted.</p>		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: Absolute Priority The applicant has presented a reform initiative that will build on the core educational assurance areas as a personalized learning environment is implemented. The initiative uses collaborative, data-based strategies ad 21 st century tools such as online learning platforms, computers, and learning strategies to deliver instruction and supports tailored to the needs and goals of students, with the aim of enabling all students to graduate college- and career-ready.		

Total	210	182
-------	-----	-----

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	15
Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments: Optional Budget Supplement The applicant presents a viable statement in regards to the challenges of both globalization and a knowledge-based economy. The optional budget includes programs such as STEM Academy, GROW, Pathway to Success, and SOAR. As evidence, it is becoming increasingly important to incorporate elements of engineering and technology into student learning as we look at future career possibilities and needs. Scientific and technological innovations have become increasingly important as we face the benefits and challenges of both globalization and a knowledge-based economy. As evidence, the revitalization of CTE programs is critical in supporting Oregon's workforce and ensuring students obtain the college and career ready skills necessary for a transition in the workplace or post-secondary training. Furthermore, the Pathway of Success prepares graduates for successful transition into a post-secondary degree program or direct workforce entry. Through the SOAR project, the faculty has long standing partnerships established with colleges and in community to support implementation. As evidence, these programs will contribute to the continuous improvement of personalized learning.		



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0375OR-3 for Salem-Keizer School District 24J

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	9
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides clear and extensive evidence for a comprehensive and cohesive reform vision. In particular, the seven core values that help facilitate its reform proposal are in line with the specific examples of actions taken to support scaling up their reform efforts. Additionally, the four educational assurance areas are indeed supported by the applicant's strategic plan, which is adopted in June, 2012 and builds from successful and research-based policies and practices. More clear evidence is necessary to demonstrate the efforts to inform instruction by using student performance data; the role of the Professional Learning Communities is not clear about defining and developing effective strategies and practices of effective teaching.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant demonstrates a high-quality school-level implementation plan involving 6 high schools and 7 feeder middle schools. It is also evident that the applicant applied the competition's eligibility requirements and excluded those that didn't meet the criteria. A list of the participating schools and the number of participating students/educators are provided in the appropriate table as recommended.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's reform proposal provides concrete examples on how district-wide changes are implemented, which includes common school schedules and AVID. The currently active grants (SIG schools, HSGI, and TIF) can help scale up the reform efforts of RTT-D. Their seven core values ensure consistent and continuous efforts to improve. In particular, the applicant demonstrates strength in reaching its outcome goals as illustrated in their initiative to reform their K-12 alignment. During the process, the efforts to make district-wide change were evident as the applicant provides an example of an effective middle school model spreading to the entire district including high schools. However, the narrative is sometimes lacking some details including actual names of schools and specific time/date when such information can help produce a more complete picture of how the applicant plans to reach its outcome goals.</p>		

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides quantitative annual goals for improved student outcomes. Increased equity is also addressed as the subgroups are appropriately categorized. However, in (a) Performance on summative assessments, a rationale for setting 3-4 percentage points as growth target per year is not clearly provided and a narrative to articulate whether/how the target in SY 2016-17(Post-Grant) is ambitious and achievable is insufficient. Similarly, the narrative for the table (b) Decreasing achievement gaps is limited. Overall, the applicant provides sparse explanations to inform about how the goals are ambitious yet achievable.</p>		

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	10
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides evidence that it has achieved positive gains in student performance (middle school), but it is unknown whether the gains in reading achievement (middle school) is consistent throughout the past four years. Additionally, their math test data indicates that the student performance is not consistent among schools within the same grade levels. Although it is mentioned that student performance data informs and improves instruction, the narrative provides limited evidence about how teachers and researchers work together to develop effective practices and their record of success is not clear about how the data-driven approach results in a clear record of success. The applicant has employed a wide range of programs to address the dropout rate and the gaps in achievement for their high school students. Their graphs on high school reading, 4-year graduation rates, and dropout rates present convincing evidence that the applicant was successful in advancing student learning. However, Student Group Performance over Time indicates inconsistent math performance especially from SY 09-10 to SY 10-11, and the discrepancy is not analyzed for improvement. Overall, the proposal does not fully provide a convincing a clear and consistent record of success in the past four years, and the data is not clear on demonstrating the applicant's ability to achieve ambitious and significant reforms in low performing schools while making data-driven decisions. It is clear that the applicant operates the Teacher Data Warehouse as well as an online parent portal making students' data accessible, but the ways how the district-wide data actually informs instruction, where and who leads the innovation, and how student performance's improved as a result remain obscure.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant demonstrates evidence that it has high transparency in the budgetary processes and practices. The applicant does provide Individual Adopted School Budgets and the pertaining budgetary information including school-level expenditures, personnel salaries for instructional/support staff, teachers, and non-personnel expenditures.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	7
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has successful conditions supported by Senate Bill 290/252 and House Bill 3474 to have a strong evaluation and support system in place. Indeed, the legislation and regulatory requirement from Oregon can help establish a P-20 focus and better alignment of student learning. However, there exists a disconnect between these conditions and what is essential for impacting student learning, such as, autonomy and the systematic supports for personalized learning environments. Teacher and Administrator</p>		

Evaluation and Support Systems provided in the application may be strong evidence on how teacher and administrator performance is evaluated to improve their professional practice, but the ways in which such an evaluation and support system impacts students' personalized learning environments are not demonstrated and remain ambiguous.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)

10

8

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrates a stakeholder engagement in developing the proposal and the stakeholders support for the proposal. Evidence includes relevant letters of support from key stakeholders including ASK ESP, Oregon Educational Investment Board, Oregon DoE, City Managers (Salem/Keizer), 4 IHEs, and other appropriate organizations. A review of emails between SKEA and Oregon DoE and the city managers provides evidence of an adherence of the 10 day comment period and some level of engagement/communication on developing the proposal beyond advising school focus and priorities. However, the applicant presents little description of how students and families were engaged in the development/revision of the proposal, and the proposal does not provide enough specifics on the revised content based on feedback.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)

5

5

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides clear evidence of their analysis of needs and gaps including the current status in implementing personalized learning environments and the convincing illustrations of ideals and realities of the proposed reform efforts. The applicant is thoughtful and strategic about their demonstrated needs and gaps. In this section, the applicant is particularly clear about what entails with aiding students in advancing for BOTH college and career -- the personalized learning is appropriately framed within authentic and deep learning, which is impressive. Also, the applicant is thoughtful about the unique needs of ELLs, secondary students, and the differentiated efforts to improve writing, math, and science, respectively.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	16
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant presents clear evidence that its plan provides students with opportunities to progress with college and career-ready standards as articulated in Conley's framework and the use of CIS. The four domains as well as focused knowledge and skills in reading, writing, research, and critical thinking can guide their reform efforts appropriately. As for addressing the learning needs for ALL students, it is noticeable that the applicant invests in partnership with local IHEs to help prepare Native Americans students for college and career readiness, in addition to their efforts to enhance the learning experiences of ELLs, students from low-income families, and students with special learning needs. The proposal does a good job of presenting a variety of high-quality programs to improve instruction and learning environments including digital learning content as demonstrated in the PEPs, the district AVID and ELL programs. The applicant also presents a clear and sound plan to sharing their student data to inform researchers (Conley and EPIC researchers) and classroom teachers to make appropriate personalized learning recommendations. Furthermore, the applicant has a learning tool, I'mReady in place to provide appropriate training (online) and support to students so that they can track and manage their learning.</p> <p>However, there is limited evidence that the applicant provides meaningful opportunities for students to have exposure to diverse culture, contexts, and perspectives that deepen individual student learning. Although the applicant explains that their career exploration instruction can provide all students meta-cognitive activities through advisory groups and separate elective courses, the details</p>		

are missing, and the plan to develop the "habits of mind" is not comprehensive as developing key human traits such as perseverance, communication, creativity, and problem solving are not thoroughly addressed.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)

20

17

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrates a sound approach to teaching and leading so that educators in the system can focus on improving instruction and supporting student progress for college and career-ready. First, the educators in the applicant's system engage in training and are encouraged to work in professional teams. For example, the Academy for Teaching and Learning provides PD courses, PLCs collaborate to use student data to inform instruction, and administrators learn through Instructional Leadership Content. The applicant also articulates about its district wide data culture of assessing, analyzing and acting on data so that adapting content and instruction is a on-going regular process. However, the applicant's capacity to improve teachers and principals' effectiveness by using feedback from the applicant's evaluative system is not clearly articulated. Second, the applicant demonstrates strong evidence that educators know how to use tools and data to accelerate student progress much part utilizing technological tools for streamlining the communication process as illustrated in the Curriculum Management System and their unique efforts to develop videotaped models of teaching in their on-demand online professional development. Additionally, the applicant's efforts to develop high quality learning resources to match student needs are well illustrated in their targeted interventions and supports as well as their differentiated planning to address the preparation of the students for careers in STEM, Business, and Human/Health Services. Third, the applicant provides school leaders and school leadership teams training, policies, systems, and practices to impact student learning. However, the details on how school leaders assess individual and collective educator school culture and climate for continuous school improvement is insufficient. Lastly, the applicant's plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective teachers is evident in their efforts to have partnership with local IHEs through course articulation, dual credit options, and programs for college certificates and industry credentials. However, the applicant's reform proposal to develop a system for maximizing effective teaching does not clearly follow up on a series of concrete steps to re-allocate effective teachers and proven administrators for students especially as to closing achievement gaps.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	11

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence that it has practices, policies, and rules that may support personalized learning, but those for evaluating student progress are unclear and lack some details. First, the applicant's central office follows a service and accountability model and values collaboration and consistent supports to schools. Second, the applicant indicates a plan for hiring project manager to facilitate the implementation of RTT-D proposal and does demonstrate flexibility and autonomy in place for school leadership teams as illustrated in their articulation about a coherence and collaboration on the why/what and about flexibility/autonomy when it comes to the how. The applicant also provides a five-process standards regarding the makeup and expectations of leadership teams at the school and department levels. Third, the applicant used teacher feedback to inform their policy on student performance evaluations by developing proficiency-related recommendations. However, there is limited evidence whether the applicant has a systematic evaluation system of student performance based on demonstrated mastery in place for both middle schools and high schools. It is noticeable that students have at least six classroom opportunities to demonstrate mastery. This ensures that the applicant provides students with the opportunity to be evaluated at multiple times. However, there is limited evidence on how the applicant ensures the opportunity to be evaluated by multiple methods. It also mentions that Proficiency-Based Teaching and Learning is not

currently mandatory for secondary level teachers, but the supporting structures and tools for the implementation is available. This lends more credence to their reflection on a reality and timing for the RTT-D reform efforts to make a difference. Nonetheless, the applicant is not clear about its commitment supported by a series of concrete action plans to evaluate their students (both middle and high school levels) based on demonstrated mastery using differentiated methods. Additionally, the applicant provides insufficient evidence on how their policies and rules facilitate instruction and resources for all students including students with disabilities and ELLs.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)

10

7

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant explains briefly about parent access to student data and creating web portals to share integrated data. However, the infrastructure (or commitment) to ensure information sharing with those who can't afford technology is not strong. Although it is clear that the applicant plans to establish a comprehensive data warehouse where data exist in inter-operable data systems, the applicant is unclear about how to use data in various electronic learning systems. The applicant does not present a strong culture of sharing data to make informed decisions and remains superficial with their level of preparation/expertise/commitment for a systematic/transparent data sharing and extending it to other stakeholders relevant to student learning.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	14
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has a strategy for implementing a continuous improvement process. For example, a stakeholder's advisory committee is to be formed, and a project manager as well as the level directors will monitor through monthly school visitation and meetings, measure and share information on the progress of RTT-D implementation. It is also assuring that accountability will be put in place both at the district level and at the school level. It is noted that progress reports on the implementation will be submitted to the advisory committee and the superintendent's Cabinet for review and action. However, it is not clear about how opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during the grant are actually created, and the ways of how the review and action on the reports can be executed into which levels and operating which teams in the district to revise part of the planning remain vague.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant presents its commitment for ongoing communication and engagement with stakeholders as its intent is evident in Communication Mission and Goals for 2012 including the Superintendent's monthly communication meetings to share information and solve problems together. The internal and external stakeholders are clearly defined, but the external stakeholders are limited by not including professional organizations of educators and researchers.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Currently, the applicant doesn't have the capacity to match student data with effective teachers/principals over multiple years as stated in the note. However, it states that the applicant is using state grant funds to build a system in response to the RTT-D's ambitious yet achievable performance measures. The applicant does provide goals, measures, and annual targets by applicable population. It is also encouraging that the district partner with researchers in an IHE to devise a robust, specific evaluation system with measurable indicators. However, the information about a new</p>		

system is insufficient. There is no narrative on how the future system is expected to help review and improve performance measure over time. Therefore, it is not feasible to fully assess the applicant's capacity with regard to their performance measures.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)

5

3

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrates evidence that it has plans to evaluate the RTT-D funded activities mostly by level directors. The applicant proposed a cycle of monitoring progress through monitoring school improvement plans; PDs; implementation of instructional coaching; data reviews and analysis; stakeholder engagement; and Strategic Plan initiative implementation. However, the plans are not cohesive enough, and evaluating the effectiveness of innovative RTT-D is lacking creativity.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	6
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: The applicant suggests that the district receives federal and state grants as well as other local revenues to fund its normal operations, and that the RTT-D grant will be used for a more differentiated allocation approach. The narrative provides the applicant's RTT-D priorities and the allocation ratios of the funds; however, the applicant is unclear about the rationale for investments and doesn't guide through the pertaining budget tables appropriately. The applicant's intent behind the budget is not clearly presented and thus limiting a feasible assessment of the extent to which the applicant's budget narrative/tables inform appropriately.		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	6
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: The applicant may have a high-quality plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant, but there is limited evidence specifying where to examine to inform financial supports from state and local government leaders. Narrative or information about a budget for the three years after the term of the grant is not found.		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	7
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: The applicant demonstrates evidence that it intends to have partnership with public and private organizations that can help provide student and family supports to address the social and emotional needs of the students. However, its approach lacks focus on (1) integrating them and (2) developing a system of continuous assessing its roles, needs, and performances. The applicant successfully provides a description of the appropriate partnership that it has formed with public or private organizations. The applicant also specify how it has scaled up best practices at all levels and illustrates how SKSD Instructional Services adapts best practices and trains teachers and staff members to increase their ability to serve students' needs better. The roles and benefits from the partnership are productive and convincing. It is also noticeable that the best practices of educational organizations (i.e., SKEF) is modeled/emulated by multiple campuses in the district; however, the applicant does not provide a through narrative on the established process of using the data to target student needs and challenges and to improve overtime based on student performance data as well as feedback from the		

relevant stakeholders. The information about population-level desired results for students in the LEA in line with the broader RTT-D proposal is also missing. Additionally, the applicant is unclear about its intent to identify its annual ambitious yet achievable performance measures for the proposed population-level.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

It is clear throughout the application that the applicant meets this priority. The applicant addresses the core educational assurance areas and intends to create student learning opportunities for personalized learning and meeting academic needs of all students for college and career-ready. Its proposal prioritizes maximizing personalized learning environments, which includes expanding student access to effective teaching practices, decreasing achievement gaps, and increasing graduation rates.

Total	210	164
-------	-----	-----

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	13

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrates clear evidence that each program merits additional funding and addresses the skills and trains that are hard to assess and that takes a consistent and continuous investment to yield meaningful outcomes. The programs include STEM Academy, Getting Ready for Oregon's Workforce, Pathway to Success, and SOAR, and the programs are to be implemented on multiple campuses. It is convincing that the programs with successful funding can contribute to a more complete implementation of the RTT-D reforms. However, some programs (i.e., Pathway to Success and Getting Ready for Oregon's Workforce) have overlapping and similar goals as well as the students with the similar needs to benefit from. The funding for teacher equipment including teacher laptops is essential for preparing teachers to execute RTT-D reforms. However, it may contradict the applicant's justification because (if the equipment is so instrumental in addressing Absolute Priority 1 to begin with,) it could have been included in the main budget, not in optional budget supplement.